FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND VIETNAMESE

SPEAKING-LEARNING STRATEGIES, ANXIETY, AND SELF-EFFICACY AMONG VIETNAMESE ENGLISH MAJORS: A SEQUENTIAL MIXED-METHODS STUDY AT VNU-IS

HOANG TUYET MINH[*] - NGUYEN THUY TIEN[**] - NGUYEN PHUONG THAO[***]

ABSTRACT: In EFL contexts, developing English speaking skills remains challenging because learners often have limited access to authentic communicative environments and may experience anxiety when speaking. This study investigates how English-major students at International School, Vietnam National University (VNU-IS) use learning strategies to develop their English speaking skills and examines how speaking anxiety and self-efficacy are associated with their strategy use. A sequential explanatory mixed-methods design was adopted, with quantitative findings used to guide and interpret the subsequent interview phase. Quantitative data were first collected through a questionnaire administered to 243 second- and third-year English majors, followed by semi-structured interviews with ten students to explain the survey findings in greater depth. The survey data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, reliability analysis, and correlation analysis, while the interview data were analyzed thematically. The findings show that all four strategy groups were used at a moderate level. Correlation results indicate that speaking anxiety had only a weak negative association with social strategies, while speaking self-efficacy showed no statistically significant association with any of the four strategy groups. These findings suggest that speaking development in this context is strategic but cautious; therefore, speaking strategy instruction should be made more explicit and accompanied by low-pressure, scaffolded speaking opportunities that help learners gradually move from prepared practice to supported spontaneous interaction.

KEY WORDS: English speaking skills; learning strategies; speaking anxiety; self-efficacy; VNU-IS.

RECEIVED: July, 2nd, 2026. EDITED: November, 17th, 2026

1. Introduction

In EFL contexts, speaking remains one of the most challenging skills to develop because learners must use language in real time and often have limited exposure to authentic English communication (Richards, 2009; Goh, 2016). This challenge is not only linguistic but also strategic and affective. Learners need ways to practise, prepare, monitor, and interact in English, while also managing anxiety and confidence when speaking. Speaking anxiety may reduce learners' willingness to participate in oral communication, whereas speaking self-efficacy may influence their persistence and engagement in speaking tasks (Horwitz et al., 1986; Bandura, 1997).

Previous research has shown that speaking-strategy use should be understood as multidimensional rather than as a single general tendency (Kehing & Yunus, 2021; Wang & Sun, 2024b). In Vietnam, studies have also examined speaking strategies and techniques for developing English speaking among university students (Truong & Phan, 2020; Vy et al., 2024). Recent Vietnamese research has examined self-regulated speaking strategies among EFL learners (Nguyen & Dinh, 2025). However, less direct evidence is available on how English majors in an international-programme context use different groups of speaking-learning strategies and how speaking anxiety and self-efficacy are associated with

*AssocProf.Dr.; International School, National University Hanoi;
Email: tuyetminh@vnu.edu.vn (Corresponding author's)
**International School, National University, Hanoi, Vietnam
***International School, National University, Hanoi, Vietnam

these strategy groups. This gap is theoretically important because it limits understanding of speaking-strategy use as both multidimensional and affect-related. This issue is also relevant beyond Vietnam because the relationships between affective factors and multidimensional speaking-strategy use remain insufficiently understood in formal higher education contexts. It is also practically important because learners may actively use strategies to improve speaking while still avoiding more socially exposed forms of communication.

The present study addresses this gap by examining English majors in the Bachelor of English Language programme at VNUIS, where students are expected to use English for academic communication and speaking-related classroom tasks. Although these students regularly use English in academic and classroom tasks, such exposure does not necessarily provide sustained opportunities for spontaneous interaction or eliminate the affective and strategic challenges involved in speaking. It aims to identify the types and frequency of speaking-learning strategies used by these students and to examine how speaking anxiety and self-efficacy are related to cognitive, metacognitive, affective, and social strategies. The study is guided by the following research questions:

1. What learning strategies for developing speaking skills are used by English majors at VNU-IS?
2. How are speaking anxiety and self-efficacy related to their use of speaking-learning strategies?

2. Literature review

Developing speaking ability in an EFL context requires more than linguistic knowledge. Speaking involves real-time formulation, pronunciation, interaction, and adjustment to listeners, often under social or evaluative pressure (Goh, 2016; Crowther & Gass, 2019). For learners who have limited exposure to English outside the classroom, speaking development may depend partly on how they practise, regulate, and evaluate their own learning. Therefore, learning strategies provide a useful lens for examining how learners actively support their speaking development over time.

Language learning strategies are commonly understood as deliberate actions or procedures that learners use to make language learning more effective, independent, and manageable (Oxford, 1990; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990). Oxford's (1990) taxonomy includes six groups: memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective, and social strategies. However, the present study does not examine general language learning strategies. It focuses specifically on speaking-learning strategies, defined here as strategies learners use to develop speaking ability through practice, planning, monitoring, emotional regulation, and interaction. This focus requires a distinction between strategies for learning to speak and strategies for handling communication while speaking. Compensation strategies mainly help learners solve immediate communication problems during real-time performance, while memory strategies are more closely related to storing and retrieving language knowledge (Oxford, 1990; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990). Since this study examines learning behaviours that support speaking development over time, it concentrates on four strategy groups: cognitive, metacognitive, affective, and social strategies.

These four groups correspond directly to the questionnaire items and to the sustained process of developing speaking skills. Cognitive strategies (CS) refer to direct work with spoken language, such as rehearsal, imitation, and the use of sentence patterns to organize ideas (Oxford, 1990; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990). Metacognitive strategies (MS) include planning before speaking, setting speaking goals, noticing mistakes, and evaluating performance (Oxford, 1990; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990). Affective strategies (AS) concern learners' attempts to manage nervousness, confidence, and emotional responses when speaking, such as relaxing before speaking, encouraging oneself, maintaining a positive attitude, and controlling nervousness (Oxford, 1990; Horwitz et al., 1986). Social strategies (SS) involve learning through interaction, feedback, clarification, and cooperation with others, namely, practicing with peers, working with others, asking for clarification, and seeking feedback (Oxford, 1990; Wang & Sun, 2024b).

Another distinction relevant to speaking development is the difference between prepared and spontaneous speaking practice. Some strategies allow learners to maintain control while other strategies

require greater social exposure. Since foreign language anxiety is often associated with oral, public, or evaluative situations, it may be more closely related to socially exposed strategies than to private preparation or self-monitoring (Horwitz et al., 1986; MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994).

Speaking anxiety and speaking self-efficacy are therefore examined alongside strategy use. Speaking anxiety refers to tension, worry, or apprehension experienced when using a foreign language orally, especially in public or evaluative situations (Horwitz et al., 1986). Speaking self-efficacy refers to learners' beliefs in their capability to perform or improve speaking tasks (Bandura, 1997). Stronger self-efficacy may support persistence, willingness to practise, and readiness to engage in challenging tasks (Wang & Sun, 2024a; Zimmerman, 2000).

Together, these constructs form the conceptual framework of the study. Within this framework, speaking anxiety and speaking self-efficacy are examined as affective variables potentially associated with the four speaking-learning strategy groups.

Previous research has examined EFL speaking strategies from several perspectives. Some studies have linked broader and more flexible strategy use with stronger speaking performance (Gani et al., 2015), while others have emphasized that speaking strategies should be understood as multidimensional rather than as a single general tendency (Wang & Sun, 2024b). Research has also explored speaking anxiety, strategy use, and oral performance (Liu, 2018), and review studies have highlighted the importance of cognitive and metacognitive strategies in speaking development (Kehing & Yunus, 2021). In Vietnam, Truong and Phan (2020), Vy et al. (2024), and Nguyen and Dinh (2025) have examined speaking-learning strategies, speaking fluency, and self-regulated speaking strategies among university learners. However, limited evidence is available on how cognitive, metacognitive, affective, and social strategies operate as an integrated speaking-learning profile and how these strategy groups are associated with speaking anxiety and self-efficacy among English majors in an international-programme context.

Taken together, three gaps remain. First, in terms of sample, limited evidence is available from English majors in a Vietnamese international-programme context. Second, in terms of measurement, fewer studies have examined cognitive, metacognitive, affective, and social strategies as one coherent speaking-learning profile while distinguishing learning strategies from immediate compensation strategies. Third, in terms of data combination, less direct evidence is available from a sequential mixed-methods design that first identifies general strategy-use patterns and then uses interviews to explain learners' preferences, difficulties, and affective experiences. Therefore, the present study investigates the types and frequency of speaking-learning strategies used by English majors at VNUIS and examines how speaking anxiety and speaking self-efficacy are associated with the four strategy groups.

3. Methods

3.1. Pedagogical Setting and Participants

The study was conducted at VNUIS, within the Bachelor of English Language (BEL) programme. This context was selected because English majors in the programme regularly engage in speaking-related tasks.

The questionnaire was completed by 243 second- and third-year English majors, including 103 second-year students and 140 third-year students. Second- and third-year students were selected because they had accumulated sufficient university-level learning experience to reflect on their speaking-learning strategies and affective experiences. Compared with first-year students, they had participated in a wider range of speaking-related classroom activities and were therefore more likely to have developed identifiable strategy preferences and speaking-related difficulties. Including both cohorts also broadened the representation of students at the intermediate stages of the programme. Most respondents self-rated their speaking level as intermediate or above, while only 16 participants reported beginner level. Convenience sampling was used because the researchers had access to these two cohorts. For the qualitative phase, ten respondents were purposively selected for follow-up interviews to ensure variation in year of study, self-rated speaking proficiency, affective profile, and speaking-learning orientation. Participants were coded as P1–P10 to protect their identities.

3.2. Design of the Study

The study adopted a sequential explanatory mixed-methods design. The quantitative phase was conducted first to identify general patterns of speaking-learning strategy use, speaking anxiety, and speaking self-efficacy. This was followed by semi-structured interviews designed to explain and contextualize the questionnaire findings.

The questionnaire was administered in English and consisted of four parts. Part A collected demographic information. Part B contained 18 items measuring cognitive, metacognitive, affective, and social speaking-learning strategies on a five-point frequency scale ranging from 1 = Never to 5 = Always. Part C contained eight items measuring speaking anxiety and speaking self-efficacy on a five-point agreement scale ranging from 1 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly agree. Part D collected supplementary information about students' perceptions of effective speaking-learning activities and was used only for pedagogical interpretation.

The speaking-learning strategy items drew on Oxford's (1990) taxonomy and O'Malley and Chamot's (1990) classification of language learning strategies. The speaking-anxiety items were informed by Horwitz et al. (1986) and MacIntyre and Gardner (1994), while the speaking self-efficacy items were grounded in Bandura's (1997) theory and speaking-specific self-efficacy research (Wang & Sun, 2024a). All items were contextualized to focus on English speaking development. Before the main administration, two experienced EFL lecturers reviewed the questionnaire for clarity, relevance, and alignment with the intended constructs, and minor wording revisions were made based on their feedback. As the questionnaire was administered in English, no translation or back-translation was undertaken.

The semi-structured interview guide covered five areas: general speaking experiences, speaking-learning strategy use, speaking anxiety, speaking self-efficacy, and perceptions of effective speaking-learning activities. Participants were asked, for example, to describe how they practised speaking and the situations in which they felt anxious or confident. Follow-up questions were used to clarify their questionnaire responses and elicit specific examples.

The sequential design allowed the questionnaire to establish broad patterns across the sample, while the interviews provided more detailed explanations of the reasons underlying those patterns

3.3. Data collection and analysis

Questionnaire data were collected through Google Forms and analyzed using SPSS. Descriptive statistics were used to describe the sample and main variables, while Cronbach's alpha was calculated to assess scale reliability. Pearson correlation was used to examine associations between speaking anxiety, speaking self-efficacy, and the four strategy groups.

The semi-structured interviews were conducted after the questionnaire phase, either in person or online. Each interview lasted approximately 18-25 minutes and focused on learners' speaking experience, strategy use, anxiety, self-efficacy, and perceived effective speaking-learning activities.

The qualitative data were analyzed manually using thematic analysis. The transcripts were read repeatedly, initial codes were generated, related codes were grouped into broader themes, and the themes were reviewed and refined. The main thematic areas concerned patterns of strategy use in speaking development, affective experiences related to strategy use, and perceived effective speaking-learning activities. The interviews were conducted in English to maintain consistency with the programme's instructional context and the language of the questionnaire. However, conducting the interviews in English may have constrained the depth and nuance of responses from participants with lower proficiency or higher speaking anxiety. This potential limitation was considered when interpreting the qualitative findings.

Ethical procedures were also followed during data collection. Participation was voluntary, informed consent was obtained, and all data were anonymized and used only for research purposes.

4. Findings and Discussion

4.1. Findings

4.1.1. Learning strategies for developing speaking skills used by English majors at VNU-IS

Table 1. *Descriptive statistics and reliability of speaking-learning strategy use*

Strategy group	Items	N	Mean	SD	Cronbach's alpha
Cognitive strategies	CS1–CS4	243	3.05	0.80	.853
Metacognitive strategies	MS1–MS4	243	3.05	0.82	.856
Affective strategies	AS1–AS5	243	2.95	0.75	.873
Social strategies	SS1–SS5	243	2.86	0.80	.879

As shown in Table 1, all four strategy groups fell within the moderate range, based on the guideline of 1.00–2.33 = low, 2.34–3.67 = moderate, and 3.68–5.00 = high. Cognitive and metacognitive strategies recorded the highest mean scores, both at 3.05, followed by affective strategies (M = 2.95). Social strategies had the lowest mean score (M = 2.86). Given the small differences among the four means, these results do not indicate a strong dominance of any single strategy group. Rather, they suggest a slight tendency toward preparation-, practice-, planning, and monitoring-related strategies rather than interaction-based strategies. Cronbach's alpha values ranged from .853 to .879, indicating good internal consistency for the four strategy scales.

The interview data helped clarify what this preparation-oriented pattern meant in practice. Controlled, preparation-based, and low-risk practice referred to behaviours such as writing scripts, translating ideas from Vietnamese into English, reading aloud, rehearsing, preparing outlines, shadowing, self-recording, checking grammar before speaking, and using speaking frameworks or templates. These practices were low-risk because they allowed learners to prepare language before exposing it to teachers, peers, or spontaneous interaction. For example, P1 described practising alone because "I usually just write things down. I practice speaking alone because I don't want anyone to hear my bad pronunciation." while P3 preferred self-practice and shadowing because "I can stop, check the dictionary, and correct my pronunciation before anyone else hears me". In the Vietnamese EFL classroom context, where speaking often takes place in front of classmates or is evaluated by teachers, such strategies helped learners manage accuracy, embarrassment, and uncertainty.

At the same time, the interviews showed that social strategies were not absent. Some participants treated interaction as an important way to improve fluency and responsiveness. P2 explained, "I just put myself out there. I join English clubs, I talk to exchange students," and preferred group discussions and role-plays because "they feel like real life." P5 also preferred "pair work and role-play" because interaction helped maintain the flow of communication, while P8 described casual chatting and voice calls as a natural way to learn how English is actually used. These accounts help explain why social strategies were still reported at a moderate level, although they had the lowest mean score among the four strategy groups.

4.1.2. Speaking anxiety, self-efficacy, and their associations with speaking-learning strategy use

Table 2. *Descriptive statistics and reliability of speaking anxiety and speaking self-efficacy*

Affective factor	*Items*	*N*	*Mean*	*SD*	*Cronbach's alpha*
Speaking anxiety	ANX1–ANX4	243	2.99	0.77	.844
Speaking self-efficacy	SE1–SE4	243	3.10	0.84	.879

Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics and reliability coefficients for speaking anxiety and speaking self-efficacy. Both constructs were reported within the moderate range. Speaking self-efficacy had a slightly higher mean score (M = 3.10, SD = 0.84) than speaking anxiety (M = 2.99, SD = 0.77), but the difference was small. The reliability coefficients were good for both scales, with α = .844 for speaking anxiety and α = .879 for speaking self-efficacy.

The interview data reflected this moderate affective profile. Some participants described clear anxiety in speaking situations, especially when speaking spontaneously or in front of others. For example, P1 reported, "My heart beats so fast and my hands shake," while P6 said that speaking English in class made them feel "very tense." At the same time, other participants expressed stronger confidence in their ability to improve. P4 stated that mistakes were "just data," and P2 described interaction as a normal part of becoming more fluent. These contrasting accounts are consistent with the survey results, which showed neither very low nor very high levels of anxiety and self-efficacy overall.

Table 3. *Correlations between affective variables and speaking-learning strategy use*

Affective variable	*Cognitive strategies*	*Metacognitive strategies*	*Social strategies*	*Affective strategies*
Speaking anxiety	r = -.016, p = .799	r = -.044, p = .490	r = -.126, p = .050	r = .018, p = .781
Speaking self-efficacy	r = -.013, p = .835	r = .065, p = .311	r = .088, p = .170	r = -.049, p = .443

Table 3 shows that most correlations between the two affective variables and the four strategy groups were weak and statistically non-significant. Speaking anxiety was not significantly associated with cognitive, metacognitive, or affective strategies. Speaking anxiety showed a small negative correlation with social strategies (r = −.126, p = .050), suggesting only a slight tendency for learners with higher anxiety to report lower use of social strategies. Given the small effect size and the threshold p value, this association should be interpreted cautiously and should not be understood as evidence that anxiety caused lower social strategy use. A separate correlation showed a weak negative association between speaking anxiety and speaking self-efficacy (r = -.178, p = .005), suggesting that respondents who reported higher anxiety also tended to report lower confidence in their speaking ability.

The interview data helped clarify why the relationship between anxiety and strategy use was selective rather than general. Anxious participants did not necessarily stop practising speaking; instead, they often chose forms of practice that reduced public exposure and allowed more control. P1 linked this avoidance directly to fear of mistakes: "The fear of making grammar mistakes makes me stay silent. It makes me rely 100% on my script. If I forget a word from my script, I just stop talking completely because I don't know how to fix it." P3 described a similar dependence on preparation, explaining, "If I am holding my cue cards, I feel secure. If the teacher says 'close your notes,' my anxiety spikes immediately." P6 also described spontaneous interaction as difficult because "my brain needs at least a few seconds to translate my thoughts," so in fast group discussions or debates, "I just stay quiet." These accounts suggest that anxiety was more visible in socially exposed speaking situations than in private preparation, rehearsal, or self-monitoring.

The interviews also clarified why speaking self-efficacy was not associated with one clear strategy pattern. More confident learners used different routes to improvement. Some treated interaction as the main route to fluency. For example, P2 preferred group discussions and role-plays because "they feel like real life" and require speakers to react to others in real time. By contrast, other confident learners preferred self-monitoring or expert feedback. P4 explained, "Recording myself and then doing self-correction. It's the most brutal but effective way. It helps me fix my intonation and identify when I am

using too many filler words." P10 also valued targeted feedback, especially from lecturers or native speakers, because it helped him judge whether a phrase sounded natural or "like translated Vietnamese." This variation is consistent with the non-significant correlations between speaking self-efficacy and the four strategy groups.

The thematic analysis generated six overlapping themes. Controlled preparation and accuracy control appeared mainly in the accounts of P1, P3, P6, P7, P9, and P10, showing that many learners used rehearsal, self-checking, and other controlled practices to reduce uncertainty before speaking publicly. Social interaction and informal communication were represented by P2, P5, and P8, suggesting that some learners valued real-time communication for fluency development. Anxiety-related avoidance was most evident in P1, P3, and P6, while confidence led to varied strategy patterns among P2, P4, and P10. These themes helped explain the quantitative pattern of stronger preparation-oriented strategy use, moderate social strategy use, and non-significant self-efficacy correlations.

Overall, the quantitative and qualitative findings suggest a preparation-oriented pattern of speaking strategy use. Students used all four strategy groups at a moderate level, but cognitive and metacognitive strategies were slightly more frequent, while anxiety appeared more closely related to socially exposed speaking practice than to strategy use as a whole.

4.2. Discussion

4.2.1. Speaking-learning strategies used by VNU-IS students

The findings for the first research question suggest that English majors at VNU-IS were not passive learners in developing their speaking skills. They reported using all four groups of speaking-learning strategies at a moderate level. However, the pattern of strategy use shows that many learners relied more on strategies that made speaking more controllable. Cognitive and metacognitive strategies were reported slightly more frequently, while social strategies were reported least frequently. This suggests that learners tended to prefer preparation, organization, rehearsal, monitoring, and evaluation over strategies requiring immediate interaction with others.

The pattern suggests that learners' strategy use should be understood not only in terms of frequency, but also in relation to the speaking conditions these strategies helped them navigate. Interview data showed that many participants described speaking development through relatively controlled practices such as scripting, rehearsal, translation, outlining, shadowing, self-recording, and self-correction. These strategies may help learners reduce uncertainty and manage the cognitive demands of speaking, especially when they feel pressure to be accurate or fluent. At the same time, these practices also allow learners to keep speaking relatively private, predictable, and low-risk. Lower reported use of social strategies therefore suggests that interaction-based learning, such as asking for clarification, seeking feedback, or practising with others, was less central to many learners' routines.

This pattern is broadly consistent with research that views strategy use as relevant to speaking development. Gani et al. (2015) found that strategic behaviour was associated with learners' speaking ability, while Kehing and Yunus (2021) showed that cognitive and metacognitive strategies have received substantial attention in speaking-related strategy research. In the Vietnamese context, Truong and Phan (2020) and Vy et al. (2024) also show that learners use various techniques to support speaking development. The present study adds to this work by showing that, in an international-programme context, English majors may be active strategy users while still preferring relatively safe and controllable ways of developing speaking ability. More specifically, their strategies often helped them reduce the risks of public mistakes, hesitation, embarrassment, or negative evaluation. In this sense, the learners' speaking development was strategic, but often cautious.

4.2.2. Affective variables and strategy use

The second research question examined how speaking anxiety and speaking self-efficacy were associated with the four groups of speaking-learning strategies. Most correlations were weak and statistically non-significant. Speaking anxiety showed only a small negative association with social

strategies, with a p value at the conventional significance threshold, while speaking self-efficacy was not significantly associated with any of the four strategy groups.

The small anxiety–social strategy correlation suggests that speaking anxiety was not broadly associated with strategy use. Instead, the interview findings showed that anxious learners continued to practise speaking but tended to favour private and controllable forms of preparation over more socially exposed activities. Social strategies require learners to interact with others, ask for clarification, seek feedback, and respond in real time. These activities may be more emotionally demanding because they involve public exposure and the possibility of negative evaluation. The interview accounts supported this interpretation, as anxious participants described fear of mistakes and avoidance of spontaneous interaction. Given the small effect size and the threshold p value, however, this pattern should be interpreted cautiously.

The absence of significant correlations between speaking self-efficacy and the four strategy groups suggests that confidence in speaking did not correspond to a single strategy profile. Although self-efficacy may support effort, persistence, and engagement (Bandura, 1997; Zimmerman, 2000), the interview data showed that relatively confident learners followed different routes to improvement. Some preferred interaction-based practice, while others relied on self-recording, self-monitoring, structured preparation, or expert feedback. This variation may explain why no particular strategy group was consistently associated with speaking self-efficacy. The findings may also reflect the broad nature of the self-efficacy scale, which measured general confidence in speaking rather than confidence in performing specific speaking tasks.

The present findings also differ in emphasis from Liu (2018), who examined the interactive effects of speaking anxiety and strategy use on oral test performance. In contrast, the present study focused on direct associations between affective variables and four groups of strategies used for longer-term speaking development. Differences in research focus, outcome measures, and analytical approach may partly explain why the associations identified in the present study were weak.

Overall, speaking anxiety and speaking self-efficacy were relevant to learners' experiences, but they were not sufficient to explain their strategy use on their own.

5. Conclusion

This study examined speaking-learning strategy use among English majors at VNU-IS and its relationship with speaking anxiety and speaking self-efficacy. The findings showed that students used all four strategy groups at a moderate level, with cognitive and metacognitive strategies reported slightly more often than social strategies. Interview data suggested that many learners preferred preparation-based and controllable practices. Social strategies were less central to many learners' routines, although some participants who described themselves as confident or fluency-oriented valued interaction-based practice. Affective variables were not strongly associated with overall strategy use: most correlations were weak and non-significant. Speaking anxiety showed only a weak and borderline negative association with social strategies, whereas speaking self-efficacy was not significantly related to any strategy group. Overall, the study suggests that speaking development in this Vietnamese EFL context was strategic but cautious. Students were not lacking in strategies; rather, many used strategies that helped them improve speaking while reducing the risks of public mistakes, hesitation, and negative evaluation.

The findings suggest three directions for speaking instruction. First, speaking-learning strategies should be taught explicitly, but instruction should begin from the recognition that learners are not strategy-poor. Many students already use strategies, although these strategies often keep speaking within a controlled and relatively safe zone. Since learners already reported using planning, rehearsal, self-monitoring, and practice-based strategies, teachers can build on these existing habits and make them more systematic.

Second, speaking classes should provide more supported interaction. Because social strategies were reported least frequently and anxiety was weakly linked to lower use of social strategies, simply

encouraging students to "speak more" may not be sufficient. Interaction should be scaffolded through pair work, small-group discussion, guided role-play, clarification routines, and structured peer feedback so that learners can practise real-time communication with lower perceived risk.

Third, instruction should help learners move from prepared speaking to more spontaneous communication. Scripts and rehearsal may help anxious learners feel safer, but overdependence on full preparation can limit flexibility in real-time speaking. Teachers can therefore design a gradual progression from full scripts to keyword notes, from rehearsed responses to timed planning, and from controlled tasks to short unscripted exchanges.

Overall, speaking instruction should support learners' need for strategic control while gradually increasing their opportunities for interactive and spontaneous communication.

Several limitations should be noted. The study was conducted at a single institution and involved only English majors, so the findings may not be generalizable to other contexts. The questionnaire data were based on self-report, and the interviews were conducted in English, which may have affected how comfortably some participants expressed their experiences. The study also did not include classroom observation or objective speaking performance assessment.

Future research should use more diverse and rigorous designs. Intervention studies could examine whether explicit speaking-strategy instruction helps learners use more social strategies and reduce speaking anxiety over time. Classroom observation and speaking journals could provide clearer evidence of how students actually use strategies during speaking tasks. Future studies should also include objective speaking performance measures and compare English majors with non-English majors to see whether the pattern found in this study applies to broader groups of Vietnamese EFL learners.

REFERENCES

1. Bandura, A. (1997), *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W. H. Freeman.
2. Crowther, D., & Gass, S. M. (2019), Speaking. In J. W. Schwieter & A. Benati (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of language learning* (pp. 258–282). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108333603.012.
3. Gani, S. A., Fajrina, D., & Hanifa, R. (2015), Students' learning strategies for developing speaking ability. *Studies in English Language and Education, 2*(1), 16–28. https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v2i1.2232.
4. Goh, C. C. M. (2016), Teaching speaking. In W. A. Renandya & H. P. Widodo (Eds.), *English language teaching today: Linking theory and practice* (pp. 143–159). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-38834-2_11.
5. Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986), Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal, 70*(2), 125–132. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1986.tb05256.x.
6. Kehing, K. L., & Yunus, M. M. (2021), A systematic review on language learning strategies for speaking skills in a new learning environment. *European Journal of Educational Research, 10*(4), 2055–2065. https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.10.4.2055
7. Liu, M. (2018), Interactive effects of English-speaking anxiety and strategy use on oral English test performance of high- and low-proficient Chinese university EFL learners. *Cogent Education, 5*(1), Article 1562410. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2018.1562410.
8. MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1994), The subtle effects of language anxiety on cognitive processing in the second language. *Language Learning, 44*(2), 283–305. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1994.tb01103.x.
9. Nguyen, H. T. V., & Dinh, H. T. B. (2025), Self-regulated speaking strategies used by Vietnamese EFL learners. *Journal of Nusantara Studies (JONUS), 10*(2), 131–157. https://doi.org/10.24200/jonus.vol10iss2pp131-157.

10. O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990), *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524490
11. Oxford, R. L. (1990), *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Heinle & Heinle.
12. Richards, J. C. (2009), *Teaching listening and speaking: From theory to practice*. Cambridge University Press.
13. Truong, M. H., & Phan, T. M. T. (2020), Speaking learning strategies employed by English-majored sophomores at College of Foreign Economic Relations. *VNU Journal of Foreign Studies, 36*(3), 82–100. https://doi.org/10.25073/2525-2445/vnufs.4558.
14. Vy, L. T. M., Huong, T. L. T., Quy, T. N., Cuong, V. Q., & Anh, N. T. (2024), Determined factors and effective strategies for developing English speaking fluency among Vietnamese university students. *PASAA, 68*, 32–63. https://doi.org/10.58837/CHULA.PASAA.68.1.2.
15. Wang, Y., & Sun, P. P. (2024a). Development and validation of scales for speaking self-efficacy: Constructs, sources, and relations. *PLOS ONE, 19*(1), Article e0297517. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0297517.
16. Wang, Y., & Sun, P. P. (2024b), Development and validation of speaking strategies for self-regulated learning questionnaire (S3RLQ): A multidimensional approach. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher, 33*(6), 1339–1350. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-023-00807-0.
17. Zimmerman, B. J. (2000), Self-efficacy: An essential motive to learn. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25*(1), 82–91. https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1999.1016.

Chiến lược học tập để phát triển kỹ năng nói tiếng Anh, lo âu khi nói và niềm tin vào năng lực bản thân của sinh viên chuyên ngành tiếng Anh Việt Nam: Nghiên cứu hỗn hợp tuần tự tại VNU-IS

Tóm tắt: Trong bối cảnh tiếng Anh như một ngoại ngữ (EFL), việc phát triển kỹ năng nói tiếng Anh vẫn là một thách thức, do người học thường có ít cơ hội tiếp cận với các môi trường giao tiếp thực và có thể trải qua trạng thái lo âu khi sử dụng tiếng Anh để nói. Nghiên cứu này nhằm tìm hiểu cách sinh viên chuyên ngành tiếng Anh tại Trường Quốc tế, Đại học Quốc gia Hà Nội (VNU-IS) sử dụng các chiến lược học tập để phát triển kỹ năng nói tiếng Anh, đồng thời xem xét mối liên hệ giữa lo âu khi nói, niềm tin vào năng lực bản thân và việc sử dụng các chiến lược này. Nghiên cứu áp dụng thiết kế phương pháp hỗn hợp giải thích tuần tự, trong đó các kết quả định lượng được sử dụng để định hướng và diễn giải giai đoạn phỏng vấn tiếp theo. Dữ liệu định lượng trước tiên được thu thập thông qua bảng hỏi với 243 sinh viên chuyên ngành tiếng Anh năm thứ hai và năm thứ ba, sau đó tiến hành phỏng vấn bán cấu trúc với 10 sinh viên nhằm lý giải sâu hơn các kết quả từ khảo sát. Dữ liệu khảo sát được phân tích bằng thống kê mô tả, phân tích độ tin cậy và phân tích tương quan, trong khi dữ liệu phỏng vấn được phân tích theo phương pháp phân tích chủ đề. Kết quả cho thấy cả bốn nhóm chiến lược nói đều được sử dụng ở mức độ trung bình. Kết quả phân tích tương quan cho thấy lo âu khi nói chỉ có mối liên hệ nghịch chiều yếu với các chiến lược xã hội, trong khi niềm tin vào năng lực bản thân trong giao tiếp nói không có mối liên hệ có ý nghĩa thống kê với bất kỳ nhóm nào trong bốn nhóm chiến lược. Những phát hiện này cho thấy việc phát triển kỹ năng nói trong bối cảnh nghiên cứu mang tính chiến lược nhưng vẫn thận trọng. Do đó, việc giảng dạy chiến lược nói cần được triển khai một cách tường minh hơn, đồng thời kết hợp với các cơ hội thực hành nói có áp lực thấp và có sự hỗ trợ theo từng bước, qua đó giúp người học từng bước chuyển từ thực hành có chuẩn bị sang tương tác tự phát có hỗ trợ.

Từ khoá: Kỹ năng nói tiếng Anh; chiến lược học tập; lo âu khi nói; niềm tin vào năng lực bản thân; VNU-IS.